

REMARKS

Claims 2-14 and 16-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15 have been cancelled, and claims 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 and 19 have been amended, by this Amendment.

The Office Action dated March 7, 2006 rejected claim 15 for insufficient antecedent basis and objected to claims 1, 15 and 16 because of informalities. The Office Action also rejected claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 15 and 19 as being anticipated by prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 2-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16-18 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Insufficient Antecedent Basis

The rejection of claim 15 for insufficient antecedent basis is set forth in part 1 on page 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, there is alleged to be insufficient antecedent basis for “said operation of buffering”. Applicants have therefore changed “said operation of buffering” to “said buffering” in amended claim 16 (claim 15 has been cancelled and claim 16 has been amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 15). It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection has been overcome by this Amendment.

Claim Objections

The objections to claims 1, 15 and 16 because of informalities are set forth in part 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, it is pointed out that “at” should be inserted after “and” in line 4 of claim 1; that “of values representative of a reference time” should be inserted after “signal” in line 8 of claim 15; and that “of the wireless mesh network” should be inserted after “stations” in line 10 of claim 15. Applicants have made the suggested changes to amended claims 2 and 16 (which correspond to original claims 1 and 15, respectively).

It is also stated that “latching a buffered value of the reference time” in line 2 of claim 16 should be changed to “buffering latched values of the reference time.” Applicants respectfully decline to make the suggested change. It is respectfully submitted that the original language is supported by page 16, lines 5-6, of the specification.

Anticipation Rejection

The anticipation rejection is set forth in part 4 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. However, applicants have amended the claims to render the anticipation rejection moot. Specifically, rejected independent claims 1 and 15 have been cancelled and dependent claims 2 and 16 have been amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of claims 1 and 15, respectively. Claims 7, 10 and 11 are now dependent on amended claim 2 and claim 19 is dependent on amended claim 16.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the currently pending claims, as amended, are allowable over the cited prior art as indicated in part 5 on page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the mailing of a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee and any other fees necessary for the consideration of this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 10-0100 (Atty. Docket NOKIA.5007US).

Respectfully submitted



Robert M. Bauer, Reg. No. 34,487

LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP

One Chase Road

Scarsdale, NY 10583

Telephone: (914) 723-4300

Facsimile: (914) 723-4301

Email: RBAUER@LSLLP.COM